

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claim 4 has been cancelled. Claims 1-3 and 5-11 have been amended. New claims 12-19 have been added.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wright et al. (6,442,598).

Wright describes a system for delivering web content from a webcast center over a broadcast medium to clients. The webcast center includes a server that gathers web pages from web sites, bundles the web pages into package files and stores the package files in a package store. The webcast center also includes a broadcast unit that retrieves the package files from the package store and delivers the package files to the clients over the broadcast medium. The client includes a subscription database that stores a directory of the web content gathered by the webcast center. A user is allowed to select preferred web content from the directory of the subscription database. A receiver at the client uses the user's preferences to collect the package files carrying the preferred web content and to reject packages carrying unwanted web content.

Contrary to the presently claimed invention, Wright does not teach or suggest processing an encoded hypermedia document extracted from a broadcast signal received in a receiver unit to connect, without a user's interaction, to the Internet address referenced in the encoded hypermedia document. Thus, Wright does not teach or suggest at least the features of the present invention that are included in the following language of claim 1:

... processing said encoded hypermedia document with a hypermedia processing program, said processing resulting in connection, without a user interaction, to an internet address referenced in said encoded hypermedia document.

Similar language is also included in new claim 16.

With respect to claim 2, Wright does not teach or suggest having application software that communicates with a broadcast receiver and responds to broadcast markup language commands in the subcarrier data received by the receiver by connecting to the Internet address referenced in the digital subcarrier data. Thus, Wright does not teach or suggest at least the features of the present invention that are included in the following language of claim 2:

... application software that runs on the processor of the computer and communicates with the broadcast receiver to control the operation of the broadcast receiver and to respond to broadcast markup language commands in said broadcast markup language document by connecting to an internet address referenced in said digital subcarrier data.

Thus, the presently claimed invention as claimed in claims 1, 2 and 16, and their corresponding dependent claims 3-13 and 17, is not anticipated by Wright.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. (103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright, et al. (6,442,598) in view of Takahisa et al. (5,564,073). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. (103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Takahisa as applied to claim 3, and further in view of Payne et al. (6,021,433). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. (6,442,598) in view of Logan et al. (6,088,455). Claims 6, 7, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. (6,442,598) in view of Payne et al. (6,021,433). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Payne et al. (6,021,433) in view of Graham et al. (5,572,201). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Payne in view of Graham as applied to claim 2, and further in view of Weinstein et al. (6,604,242).

Takahisha discloses a broadcast system that includes a device to compare program material to be transmitted with a database of known material, and to transmit with the program material data corresponding to that program material. An associated receiving system stores the data in memory and displays, at the selection of the user, the data corresponding to the program material. The user selectively stores the data on a magnetic recording card for electronic coupon or other uses.

Takashisha lacks at least the same features of the presently claimed invention that are missing from Wright. Specifically, Takashisha does not teach or suggest at least processing an encoded hypermedia document extracted from a broadcast signal received in a receiver unit to connect, without a user's interaction, to the Internet address referenced in the encoded hypermedia document, as claimed in claims 1 and 14 of the present invention. In addition, Takashisha does not teach or suggest having application software that communicates with a broadcast receiver and responds to broadcast markup language commands in the subcarrier data

received by the receiver by connecting to the Internet address referenced in the digital subcarrier data, as claimed in claim 2 of the presently claimed invention.

Payne discloses a system for data communication that broadcasts notification centric data to users. Information sources transmit data to a central broadcast server, which preprocesses the data for wireless broadcast. The notification centric portions of data are wirelessly broadcast to wireless receiving devices that are attached to computing devices. Upon receipt of the data at the computing device, the user is notified through different multimedia alerts that there is an incoming message. Upon receiving a message, the user can request to be connected back to the information source for obtaining detailed data.

Contrary to the presently claimed invention, Payne does not teach or suggest at least connecting a user, without his or her interaction, to the Internet address referenced in the encoded hypermedia document. In Payne, a user has to push a designated button in the viewer to be connected back to the information source (col. 5, lines 55-58). In the presently claimed invention, in contrast, the user is connected to the Internet address referenced in the received data without any interaction. Thus, Payne lacks at least the same features that are missing from Wright and Takashisha.

Logan discloses a system for editing broadcast programming signals to allow a user to compile a proprietary signal tailored to the user's individual preferences. Logan lacks at least the above-referenced features that are missing from Wright, Payne, and Takashisha.

Graham discloses a warning system for alerting a person to an emergency situation. Garham lacks at least the above-referenced features that are missing from Wright, Payne, Logan and Takashisha.

Weinstein discloses a system for web information browsing, in which web information is presented in conjunction with a broadcast television image, either at an edge of the image screen or overlaid with the image screen in an opaque, transparent or translucent image. Weinstein lacks at least the above-referenced features that are missing from Wright, Payne, Logan, Graham and Takashisha

Thus, the references cited by the Examiner, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the presently claimed invention as claimed in claims 1, 2 and 16. Accordingly, the presently claimed invention as claimed in claims 1, 2 and 16, and their corresponding dependent claims 3-13 and 17, is patentable over the cited references.

With respect to new claim 18, the cited references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest processing an encoded hypermedia document extracted from a broadcast signal received in a receiver unit with a hypermedia processing program, with the processing resulting in redemption of listener credits, as claimed in claim 18 of the present invention. Accordingly, claim 18 and its dependent claim 19 is patentable over the cited references.

Conclusion

In response to the Office Action of December 22, 2003, it is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein all rejections have been overcome. All claims are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: May 24, 2004


Marina Portnova (Reg. No. 45,750)

Customer No. 008791
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300